

DELEGATED ITEM

Proposed Modifications to Road Humps - Limeside Road, Limeside, Oldham

Report to Assistant Executive Director, Corporate Property

Portfolio Holder : Councillor D Hibbert – Housing and Environment

Officer Contact: John Booth
Ext. 5559

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to replace the existing road humps on Limeside Road with more bus friendly traffic calming measures and to seek support for the formal legal advertisement of these changes (Hump Notice).

Executive Summary

The Council has secured external funding through the Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF) see delegated report 3 September 2012, to carry out improvements on the Quality Bus Partnership Network (QBPN). These improvements are aimed at improving bus journey times and improve the comfort for passengers using bus services. Some of the measures under this initiative have already been delivered / are in the process of being delivered however, in the case of Limeside Road some of the measures proposed require a legal advertisement (Hump Notice).

This proposal will also continue previous work undertaken in 2011/12 which was funded by the Council's Transport Capital Programme. This work involved various modifications to make the measures more bus friendly on Elm Road between Trough Gate and St Chad's Crescent.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the traffic calming measures on Limeside Road are modified as detailed in this report are approved and taken forward.

Proposed Modifications to Road Humps – Limeside Road, Limeside, Oldham**1 Background and Current Position**

- 1.1 On 23 March 2012 the Department for Transport announced that TfGM's BBAF bid had been successful and would receive £5 million (£3.522 million capital and £1.477 million revenue). The bid comprised a package of measures aimed at increasing bus patronage, with the joint objectives of promoting economic growth and reducing carbon emissions. The measures were to be delivered over 2012/13 and 2013/14.
- 1.2 The 'Improvements to the Quality Bus Partnership Network in Oldham' scheme secured £195,000 of BBAF funding. This would be used to review certain bus routes in Oldham and where buses experience journey time delays or difficulty in negotiating streets eg due to parked cars, appropriate measures would be identified and implemented.
- 1.3 Following discussions with TfGM and bus operators, Limeside Road was identified as a route where difficulties / discomfort was being experienced. This was due to out dated traffic calming measures which passenger transport vehicles find difficult to traverse.
- 1.4 The existing "Limeside Area Traffic Calming Scheme" was approved by the Council's Development Services Committee in May 1994 and constructed shortly afterwards. The scheme consisted of a mixture of various road hump types on both the distributor roads (Elm Road / Trough Gate / Lime Green / Limeside Road) and side roads.
- 1.5 The type of speed humps deployed in the earlier traffic calming schemes such as this were constructed using a combination of bituminous materials and precast concrete kerbs. The features had heights of up to 100mm with shorter, steeper mastic ramps. Consequently this type of measure, whilst proving very successful in reducing vehicle speeds is relatively expensive to maintain and is higher, at 100mm, than current standards now recommend.
- 1.6 Although, the scheme functions successfully as a casualty reduction solution it has reportedly created a number of issues for the bus operations serving the Limeside area. A report produced in June 2005 by First Bus (the principal bus operator) detailed a number of "disadvantages" of the older safety engineering techniques used at various locations in the borough; they include:
 - Discomfort to passengers. This could deter bus usage and therefore is contrary to Local Transport Plan objectives relating to sustainable travel and modal shift;
 - Discomfort and health concerns by bus drivers. There are reported back problems to drivers who complete the route;

- Potential damage to vehicles. This is however confined to very few humps within the Borough; and
- Delay to vehicles compared to speed cushions

1.7 As result of this a scheme was proposed and taken forward in 2011/12 which was funded through the Council's Transport Capital Programme. This work involved various modifications to the existing road humps on Elm Road between Trough Gate and St Chad's Crescent where the existing road humps were replaced with more bus friendly traffic calming measures. However, the funding available at the time was not sufficient to replace all the measures on the route.

1.8 Following concerns raised by TfGM and the bus operators and building on work previously undertaken directly by the Council in 2011/12, part of the Better Bus Buses Area Fund has been identified to carry out the remaining modifications to speed humps on Limeside Road.

1.9 All the proposed work identified above is being completely funded from the BBAF funding secured through TfGM. It is not considered that any of the measures being put forward at this stage have any additional impact over those that are already in place but instead ensure that the measures on site are both compliant with current standards and improve the public transport experience.

2 Existing Site Conditions

2.1 There are currently traffic calming measures already in place but these measures cause bus operators and passengers alike a great deal of discomfort due to their out dated design.

2.2 The current condition of the vast majority of the measures to be replaced is generally poor. A number of the speed tables show significant signs of distress and deterioration in both their bituminous and kerbed elements although many of the measures have been repaired in the past to varying standards.

2.3 The existing speed tables where constructed with heights of either 75 or 100mm. None of the measures have flat tops consistent with current bus friendly hump standards, being generally only 6m in length.

2.4 Due to the area being residential in nature there are various driveways in place which will need to be considered and incorporated into the design.

3 Options/Alternatives

3.1 Option 1: To approve the recommendation.

3.2 Option 2: Not to approve the recommendation.

4 Preferred Option

4.1 The preferred option to approve is Option 1.

5 Proposals

- 5.1 The original Limeside Road traffic calming scheme was introduced in 1995 to address speed and road casualty levels. The scheme consists of a mixture of various road humps on Elm Road / Trough Gate / Lime Green and Limeside Road (including side roads). The scheme has been successful as a casualty reduction solution however; it has created a number of issues for the bus operations serving the Limeside area, principally around passenger discomfort and damage to buses.
- 5.2 In 2004 it was originally proposed to replace all the existing traffic calming measures on Elm Road / Trough Gate / Lime Green and Limeside Road (excluding side roads) with measures that conform to current design standards however, the budget available at the time was not sufficient and as such approximately only half the measures have been replaced.
- 5.3 Those measures that are left continue to cause discomfort and potential damage to vehicles. It is therefore proposed that under the BBAF those remaining are replaced with more appropriate speed reducing features.
- 5.4 A number of options have been considered to address the concerns of the bus operators and at the same time, will provide a similar level of road safety afforded by the current measures.
- 5.5 Currently recognised bus-friendly measures include speed cushions, speed humps and speed tables. Each of these measures has a maximum of 75mm in height and have, in the case of humps and tables, ramp gradients of 1 in 15. Compared to standard speed tables, bus friendly measures have a continuous flat area of 7.5 metres compared to the shorter ones at 6 metres. Speed cushions, on the other hand are designed to be partially straddled by larger vehicles, including buses but in isolation are less successful in reducing the overall speed of traffic.
- 5.6 To achieve comparable reductions in traffic speeds, cushions generally speaking should not be introduced in isolation but ideally as part of a strategy that includes a combination of other measures, for example speed tables. This will be the case for Limeside Road.
- 5.7 Although traffic calming measures already exist at this location due to the changes proposed at a number of locations the formal advertisement of a Road Hump Notice will be required and this will be advertised for period 28 days.

6 Proposals and Justification

- 6.1 The preferred option involves the replacement of the existing road humps on Limeside Road in line with the design guidance for bus friendly measures. In all cases the flat tops will be extended to 7.5 metres and reconstructed with ramps 1.125 metres long having gradients of 1 in 15. Where this is not possible speed cushions will be used.
- 6.2 In all cases, the replacement road humps will be provided in the same location as the existing ones being removed. The exact positions will be such that they will accommodate residents' existing access and the highway drainage requirements. The General Arrangement of the proposals is shown on Drawing Number 1053865/LS/100/01 (see appendix A).

7 Consultation

- 7.1 G.M.P. View - The Chief Constable has been consulted and has no objection to this proposal.
- 7.2 T.f.G.M. View - The Director General has been consulted and supports the proposal.
- 7.3 G.M. Fire Service View - The County Fire Officer has been consulted and has no comment on this proposal.
- 7.4 N.W. Ambulance Service View - The County Ambulance Officer has been consulted and has no comment on this proposal.
- 7.5 As part of the original Limeside Area Traffic Calming Scheme, introduced in 1994 an extensive public consultation exercise was carried out. This exercise involved the delivery of 2000 leaflets and postcards to the local residents along with three staffed exhibitions at Walkers Road Community Centre and Limehurst County Primary School.
- 7.6 There was an overwhelming 85% who supported the scheme. It's clear that the original scheme had a clear mandate from the local community and given the proposal simply modifies the humps and they are being replaced in their exact position a further public consultation exercise is therefore not deemed necessary. It should be noted however, that site notices will be erected on site advising of the changes and a letter will be issued to residents prior to construction starting informing of the scheme.

8 Comments Of Hollinwood Ward Councillors

- 8.1 The Ward Councillors have been consulted and have no comment on the proposal.

9 Financial Implications

9.1 Summary Implications

9.1.1

	Budget	Report Implications	Variance
	£'000s	£'000s	£'000s
Capital	39	39	0
Financed by:			
BBAF grant	(39)	(39)	0
Total Capital Implication	0	0	0
Revenue			
Revenue – Design and project design and supervision fees for scheme	8	8	0
Revenue - on-going maintenance costs	0	0	0
Total Revenue Implications	8	8	0

9.2 Capital Implications

9.2.1 The works detailed within this report are part a larger scheme included within the Neighbourhoods Transport Capital Programme 2013/14, Cost Centre M0471 – BBAF - Bus Network Improvement, and funded from Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF) grant. The scheme also includes an element of revenue costs for project design and supervision, which is also fully funded from the BBAF grant and included within section 10.3.1.

9.2.2 The overall scheme has approved BBAF grant funding of £119k, of which £39k is for the works described within this report. A breakdown of the capital costs associated with the works is detailed below.

Scheme capital costs

Construction Element	£
Prelims	4,500
Site Clearance	2,000
Drainage	2,500
Earthworks	250
Pavements	14,000
Footways	9,000
Signs and roadmarkings	2,750
Contingency @10%	3,500
Total capital costs	<u>38,500.00</u>

9.2.3 The costs include a contingency of 10% and all works must be completed by 31 March 2014 to meet the grant terms and conditions.

9.3 Revenue Implications

9.3.1 The overall scheme has approved BBAF grant funding of £48k for revenue costs associated with the project, of which £8k relates to the works detailed within this report. Below details the revenue costs associated with the capital works described.

Scheme revenue costs

Fee Element	£
Design fee element	£4,500
Regulatory fee element	£2,500
	<u>£7,000</u>
Other Costs	£
Hump Notice	£600
	<u>£600</u>
Total revenue costs	<u>£7,600</u>

9.3.2 It is not anticipated that the scheme will lead to any additional repair and maintenance costs, and any costs incurred should be met within existing Highways budgets.

9.3.3 If there are pressures in this area as the year progresses, the Directorate will have to manage its resources to ensure that there is no adverse overall variance at year end. (Jenny Large / Jonathan Davies)

10 Legal Services' Comments

10.1 The Council should satisfy itself that the proposals will be effective in reducing or preventing road accidents and will justify the expenditure incurred. It will be necessary to publish details of the proposals in one or more local newspapers and consider any objections received before deciding whether to proceed with the proposals. (A Evans)

11 Cooperative Agenda

11.1 In respect of improvements to the Quality Bus Partnership Network there are no Co-operative issues or opportunities arising and the proposals are in line with the Council's Ethical Framework.

12 Human Resources Comments

12.1 None.

13 Risk Assessments

13.1 None.

14 IT Implications

14.1 None.

15 Property Implications

15.1 None.

16 Procurement Implications

16.1 None.

17 Environmental and Health & Safety Implications

17.1 Energy – Nil.

17.2 Transport - The proposals in this report will support the Council's sustainable transport policies by improving the reliability of bus services.

17.3 Pollution – Nil.

17.4 Consumption and Use of Resources – Nil.

17.5 Built Environment – Nil.

17.6 Natural Environment – Nil.

17.7 Health and Safety – Nil.

18 **Equality, Community Cohesion and Crime Implications**

18.1 None.

19 **Equality Impact Assessment Completed?**

19.1 No.

20 **Key Decision**

20.1 No.

21 **Forward Plan Reference**

21.1 Not applicable.

22 **Background Papers**

22.1 The following is a list of background papers on which this report is based in accordance with the requirements of Section 100(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. It does not include documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act:

File Ref : 1049351 (Unity Partnership)
Name of File : Bus Lane Review
Officer Name : John Booth
Contact No : 0161 770 5559

23 **Proposal**

23.1 It is proposed that the construction of road humps on Limeside Road, Limeside are implemented in accordance with the following schedule.

Schedule



Proposed Construction Of Road Humps
Limeside Road, Limeside

Kerb-to-kerb speed table – length of top 7.5 metres, height 75mm, ramp gradient 1 in 15

<u>Road</u>	<u>Location</u>
Lime Green	23 metres south west of White Bank Road
Limeside Road	55 metres north west of Lime Green Road 50 metres south east of Rowan Tree Road 47 metres north west of Pine Tree Road 85 metres south east of Seventh Avenue

Pair of speed cushions – length 3.6 metres, width 1.7 metres, height 75mm

<u>Road</u>	<u>Location</u>
Limeside Road	35 metres north west of Rowan Tree Road 57 metres north west of Ninth Avenue

Signed <u></u> Assistant Executive Director Corporate Property	Dated <u>21/2/14</u>
Signed <u></u> Cabinet Member Housing and Environment	Dated <u>21/2/2014</u>

Report Tracking	
<u>Where</u>	<u>When</u>
EMT	
Leadership	
Joint Leadership	
Overview & Scrutiny	

2768

**COMMERCIAL SERVICES DIRECTORATE
PROFORMA FOR MODERN.GOV DECISION RECORDING**

PROPOSED REPORT				
Decision: Delegated		Decision Date: (d/m/yyyy)		
Title of Report: Proposed Modifications to Road Humps - Limeside Road, Limeside, Oldham				
Decision Summary:				
Accompanying Documents:				
Title of report:				
Restricted / Not Restricted:				
Restricted Paragraph: (only paragraph number required)				
Type of Decision: Key / <u>Non-Key</u>				
Funding: Is this report subject to S106 funding Yes/ <u>No</u> (If Yes, refer to Liz Kershaw)				
Portfolio holder that decision relates to: Cllr D. Roberts J McMahon				
Options considered:		Options rejected:		
Consultation Process: Ward Cllrs				
Wards Affected:	Alexandra Chadd Central Chadd North Chadd South Coldhurst Crompton	Fails East Fails West Hollinwood ✓ Medlock Vale Royton North Royton South	Sadd North Sadd South Sadd West & Lees Shaw St James'	St Mary's Waterhead Wemeth ALL
Author of Report: John Booth				
Contact Details: John.booth@unitypartnership.com				
Approved by AFD/Unity Director: 